

C O N F I D E N T I A L

28 June 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR : D/DCI/NI

SUBJECT : Priority Ranking of Collection Requirements  
and the Evaluation Process

1. At the risk of presenting a proposal that is too simplistic for the complex world of KIQS and KEPS, I offer the following thoughts:

a. It is not only possible to rank requirements, it is an essential part of any rational collection effort.

b. Ranking should be by groupings. A strict numerical ordering is neither necessary nor helpful to the collector as he seldom has to make a choice between two or more high priority requirements that are near the same relative importance.

25X1  
25X1

C O N F I D E N T I A L

C O N F I D E N T I A L

d. We try to collect information on too many marginal subjects. This diverts our scant resources from important targets. These "garbage" requirements mislead the collector and clog up the collection, analysis and evaluation processes.

2. I would offer the following three major categories under a priority "I" heading:

- Political/military plans and intentions toward the U.S. and its allies.
- Leadership changes, shifts, attitudes, the decision-making process and resource allocation.
- Strategic capabilities - offensive and defensive.
  - a. In operational use or close to production.
  - b. In research and development or prototype stage.

Under a priority "II" heading I would list:

- Tactical capabilities or weapon systems with clear strategic implications.

Under a priority "III" heading you could list:

- Everything else worth collecting.

3. An evaluation system that does not help resource managers is useless. Even worse is an evaluation system that is incomprehensible. An attempt to quantify a year's intelligence product on any requirement is both useless and probably incomprehensible. Beyond the general statement that 200 reports on a priority collection requirement are probably better than one report, the quantification process goes rapidly downhill. Therefore, why even try to quantify. The data is usually subjective and the evaluation must be subjective. Any good analyst or reports officer knows if they have a better understanding of their subject matter than was true a year ago. They also know if the reporting from a particular collector has been negligible, or marginal, helpful, of significance, of prime importance, etc. A few subjective

C O N F I D E N T I A L

CONFIDENTIAL

paragraphs by the responsible NIO after consulting with the analysts and other users, is probably all that is needed or wanted by the resource managers. In some instances, the evaluation process will not have to be subjective, as the requirement may be totally satisfied. For example, the collection effort against a particular cruise missile ends when we have enough data to develop countermeasures.



25X1

CONFIDENTIAL